UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/823,457 | 03/30/2001 | Burton L. Levin | TAL/7146.101 | 5723 |

7590 04/05/2006

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| DIVINE, LUCAS |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2625 | |

Timothy A. Long
Chernoff, Vilhauer, McClung & Stenzel, LLP
1600 ODS Tower
601 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, OR 97204-3157

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/823,457 | LEVIN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Lucas Divine | 2625 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 February 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *5-13 and 19-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *5-13 and 19-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 March 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/23/06 has been entered.

### *Response to Amendment*

2. Claims 5 – 13 and 19 – 22 are pending.

### *Drawings*

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the 'processing of said data for image reproduction characteristics' and a step of 'said first scan is written into a memory' must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). Also, the time intervals described in the claims are not shown in the drawings to assist in determining what is being claimed. No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing

should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Claim Objections*

4. Claims 5, 11, and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities: in the phrase 'with the processing of said data' in the newly added limitations Examiner believes that applicant meant 'with the processing said **scan** data' due to the fact that scan data is what has generally been discussed previously in the claims. Thus, the claims will be analyzed assuming that scan data is what was meant. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 5 – 13 and 19 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for calculating for scaling, does not reasonably provide enablement for the specifics of calculating other image reproduction characteristics during time intervals. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The description discusses the broad idea of calculating scaling parameters, but does not give specific enabling support for calculating other characteristics during set time intervals.

6. Claims 5 – 13 and 19 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Examiner has not found adequate support for 'calculating ... is performed over a time interval that begins before data from said first scan is written into memory' and applicant has not pointed out in associated remarks or responded to a telephone inquiry. In general, Examiner finds no detailed discussion about time intervals and executing certain operations during set parts of time interval or how calculation starts before any data from the first scan is written into any memory. Thus, applicant has submitted new matter into the claims and they are rejected under § 112, first paragraph.

7. Claims 5 – 13 and 19 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In two portions of the new limitation, the claim is indefinite

and unclear as to what the applicant is claiming. Firstly, 'calculating at least one of a magnification and a reduction of said original is performed over a time interval before data from said first scan is written into a memory.' This is claiming that before any data from the first scan is written into any memory, the calculating begins. Examiner believes this to be impossible. Data from a scan must be read into some sort of cache, register, buffer, RAM, hard disk, a memory, before it can be operated on. Or else the data during operation would be lost. For example, in performing calculation operations stores and loads are some of the fundamental operations which store and load the data from a memory for performing calculations on. Thus, Examiner believes that the claim is not definite because it is not possible for a computer to perform calculation operations without any stored data to calculate on. Secondly, 'scaling over at least a portion of said interval.' The scaling is referring to the calculating and other characteristics are performed, but then the claim would be saying that the scaling is done over at least a portion of the interval, when it says above that the calculating is done over the whole time interval. Thus the claim is unclear as to what is being performed over the whole interval and at least a portion. Clarification of indefiniteness issues is required to make the claim statutory. For prior art purposes, the new limitation will be interpreted to mean that the calculating can occur concurrently with the processing of other characteristics.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

1. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gusmano (US 5796877) in view of Takahagi.

Regarding claim 5, Gusmano teaches **a method of producing a copy of an original scaled to fit a selected copy medium comprising the steps of:**

**(a) scanning said original at a full resolution to convert said original to a plurality of scan data representing a plurality of pixels of said original** (Fig. 1 scanner 23, col. 2 lines 65-67, wherein the scanner scans an original to produce image scan data);

**(b) calculating at least one of a magnification and a reduction of said original to scale a copy of said original to fit at least one of a length and a width of said copy medium** (Fig. 2 step S11, col. 3 lines 17-20, wherein a scaling factor is computed to determine the size the original would be to fit on the output medium, further shown in Figs. 3 and 4); **and**

**(c) printing said copy from said scan data at one of said calculated magnification and reduction** (col. 3 lines 21-25).

(d) the calculating can occur concurrently with the processing of other characteristics (S5, wherein other characteristics are processed during the calculating; also col. 2 lines 59-60).

Gusmano does not specifically teach only performing one scan to complete the tasks of scanning in order to detect original size and only using the scan data of one scan for printing as well.

However, Takahagi et al. (US 6621994) teaches a prescanless mode where only one scan is performed, and that first scan data is used for size detection, printing and all other tasks (col. 7 line 7 – col. 9 line 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to not use a prescan and only have one full scan in scanning, image processing, and printing systems as taught by Takahagi. The motivation for doing so would have been to speed up the time per original (Takahagi col. 9 lines 11-15).

2. Claims 6 and 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gusmano and Takahagi as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Furuoya (5805294).

Regarding claim 6, which depends from claim 5, Gusmano and Takahagi teaches all of the limitations of parent claim 5 including **(d) calculating a scale that does not exceed at least one of length and said width of said copy medium** (Gusmano Fig. 2 step S11, col. 3 lines 17-20, wherein a scaling factor is computed to determine the size the original would be to fit on the output medium, further shown in Figs. 3 and 4).

While Gusmano teaches detecting the size of an input document (col. 3 line 40), the combination does not specifically teach counting the lines between first and second detected lines for this detection.

Furuoya teaches:

**(b) identifying a first scan line corresponding to a first boundary of said original** (counting of the lines implies identifying the lines to count);

**(c) identifying a second scan line corresponding to a second boundary of said original image** (counting of the lines implies identifying the lines to count); **and**

**(d) determining a number of scan lines intervening between said first and said second scan lines** (Fig. 4 line counter $23_2$, col. 3 lines 60-61, wherein the lines are counted to determine document size).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to detect document size, as in Gusmano for detecting the size of the image with the method of Furuoya , namely detecting the length of a document by counting the scan lines as well known to those of ordinary skill in the art. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide more correct document size calculations (col. 2 lines 4-5, wherein the method of Furuoya provides for correct detection of positions of edges).

Regarding claim 7, which depends from claim 6 as it depends from claim 5, the pixel counter $23_1$ in Fig. 4 shows the ability to detect and count pixels in a line, thus teaching **identifying a line of said scan data comprising a scan datum corresponding to a pixel of said original.**

3. Claims 8 – 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gusmano, Takahagi, and Son.

Regarding claims 8 and 9, which depends from claim 5, while Gusmano teaches detecting the size of an input document (col. 3 line 40), the combination does not specifically teach using pixel boundary locating for this detection.

Son teaches:

**(a) locating a first boundary datum (claim 9 specifies pixel) of said original in a line of scanned data (pixels)** (col. 5 line 37 teaches working with a group of successive pixels, thus implying detecting pixels);

**(b) locating a last boundary datum (claim 9 specifies pixel) of said original in a line of scanned data (pixels)** (col. 5 line 37 teaches working with a group of successive pixels, thus implying detecting pixels);

**(c) repeating steps (a) and (b) for another line of scan data** (Fig. 2 step 108, col. 6 line 58, wherein the detection process is repeated for a plurality of lines);

**(d) locating a first boundary of said original from said location of said first detected pixel** (Fig. 2 step 104, wherein an edge is located from the location of pixels in the scan line);

**(e) locating a second boundary of said original from said location of said another detected pixel** (Fig. 2 step 112 wherein another edge is found from the location of pixels in the scan line); **and**

**(f) calculating a scale of a distance between said first and said second boundary** (Fig. 2 step 118 shows the left and right edge coordinates and col. 6 line 41 teaches summing the pixels in a line which is the distance between the edges).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to calculate the size of an image by the method of Son in the image size detecting step of Gusmano. The motivations for doing so would have been to save memory space by providing proper clipping to only save what is needed in the memory (Son col. 2 lines 3-4), to provide a more robust edge detection algorithm (Son col. 6 line 48), and to perform size detection without the use of extra hardware

because the edge detection is completed not by hardware units but by software steps in controller/processor 50 as shown in Fig. 3 of Son.

Regarding claim 10, which depends from claim 5, which depends from claim 5, Gusmano teaches all of the limitations of parent claim 5 including **(f) calculating at least one of a magnification and a reduction to scale said dimension of said original image to fit at least one of said length and said width of said copy medium** (Fig. 2 step S11, col. 3 lines 17-20, wherein a scaling factor is computed to determine the size the original would be to fit on the output medium, further shown in Figs. 3 and 4).

While Gusmano teaches detecting the size of an input document (col. 3 line 40), Gusmano does not specifically teach using pixel boundary locating for this detection.

Son teaches:

**(a) identifying a plurality of said scan data corresponding to a line of scanned pixels** (col. 5 line 10 teaches processing of a line of pixels, thus having been identified);

**(b) locating a detected pixel of said original in a line of scanned pixels** (col. 5 line 37 teaches working with a group of successive pixels, thus implying detecting pixels);

**(c) repeating steps (a) and (b) for another line of scan data** (Fig. 2 step 108, col. 6 line 58, wherein the detection process is repeated for a plurality of lines);

**(d) locating a first boundary of said original from said location of at least one of said detected pixels of at least one line of scanned pixels** (Fig. 2 step 104, wherein an edge is located from the location of pixels in the scan line); **and**

**(e) calculating a dimension of said original image from said location of said boundary** (Fig. 2 step 118 shows the left and right edge coordinates and col. 6 line 41 teaches summing the pixels in a line which is the distance dimension between the edges).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to calculate the size of an image by the method of Son in the image size detecting step of Gusmano. The motivations for doing so would have been to save memory space by providing proper clipping to only save what is needed in the memory (Son col. 2 lines 3-4), to provide a more robust edge detection algorithm (Son col. 6 line 48), and to perform size detection without the use of extra hardware because the edge detection is completed not by hardware units but by software steps in controller/processor 50 as shown in Fig. 3 of Son.

Regarding claim 11, all of the method steps of claim 11 are the same method steps as claimed in claim 10 as it depends from claim 5. Therefore, claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above in the rejections of 5 and 10.

Regarding claim 12, which depends from claim 11, Gusmano further teaches the steps of:

**(a) storing said scan data** (the bottom of col. 2 to the top of col. 3 teach the storing of scanned data into memory); **and**

**(b) printing said copy from said stored scan data** (col. 3 line 4 discusses the microprocessor retrieving scan data from memory and line 25 teaches the final printing of said stored scan data).

4. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Son, Takahagi, and Gusmano as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Furuoya.

Regarding claim 13, which depends from claim 19, while the combination of Gusmano, Takahagi, and Son teach the scanning, size detection, and auto-size adjusting of an original, the combination does not specifically teach calculating the number of scan lines.

Furuoya teaches a scanning system for document size detection including calculating the number of scan lines (Fig. 4 line counter $23_2$, col. 3 lines 60-61, wherein the lines are counted to determine document size) as including in **the steps of:**

**(a) identifying a first scan line corresponding to a first boundary of said original** (counting of the lines implies identifying the lines to count and the first boundary is identified as the reset location at the end of a page scan; see col. 3 line 62 where the document line counter is reset when the end is reached);

**(b) identifying a second scan line corresponding to a second boundary of said original image** (counting of the lines implies identifying the lines to count and the second boundary is identified in order to reset to the start location at the end of a page scan; see col. 3 line 62 where the document line counter is reset when the end is reached); **and**

**(c) determining a number of scan lines intervening between said first and said second scan lines** (Fig. 4 line counter $23_2$, col. 3 lines 60-61, wherein the lines are counted to determine document size).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to detect document length, as in Son with the method of Furuoya, namely detecting the length of a document by counting the scan lines as well known to those of ordinary skill in the art. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide more correct document size calculations (col. 2 lines 4-5, wherein the method of Furuoya provides for correct detection of positions of edges).

5. Claims 19, 20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rourke (US 5191429), Takahagi, and Son.

Regarding claim 19, Rourke teaches **a method of producing a plurality of copies** (Fig. 9) **of an original** 160 **on a copy medium** 108 **comprising the steps of:**

**(a) scanning to convert a line of pixels of said original to scan data** (scanning completed by scanner 6, wherein the image is converted to pixel scan data, col. 3 lines 6-16);

**(e) calculating a size of said original image** (the image size is calculated by the system as shown in Fig. 10 in the image size box as well as implied by the cropping done to the image after knowing its size within the platen, discussed in col. 6 lines 35-52);

**(f) calculating a multiple of said size that will not exceed a dimension of a selected copy medium** (shown as the 7th step of Fig. 14 and taught in col. 7 lines 60-63); **and**

**(g) printing from said scan data a plurality of copies of said original equal to said multiple** (shown as the 9th step of Fig. 14 as printed by printer 8)

(h) the calculating can occur concurrently with the processing of other characteristics (Fig. 7, wherein other characteristics are processed during the calculating).

While Rourke teaches a multi-function scanning/image processing/printing system for the scanning, adjusting, and printing of documents, Rourke fails to specifically teach utilizing pixel information for determining the original size.

Son teaches an edge detection system for use in multi-function office products (col. 2 lines 16-18) including utilizing pixel information for determining the original size. Son's size determining includes the following steps:

**(b) detecting a pixel of said original in said line of scanned pixels** (col. 4 lines 16-17, wherein scanned pixel data is input into the detection scheme and pixels are implicitly detected in pixel data);

**(c) repeating steps (a) and (b) for a plurality of lines of a full resolution scan of said original** (Fig. 2 step 108, col. 6 line 58, wherein the detection process is repeated for a plurality of lines);

**(d) locating a boundary of said original from at least one of said detected pixels of at least one of said lines of scanned pixels** (Fig. 2 step 104, col. 2 lines 36-42 and col. 6 lines 1-8, wherein the step of locating an edge 'boundary' is completed by pixel analysis of the line of scanned pixels); **and**

**(e) calculating a size of said original image from said location of said boundary** (col. 6 lines 62-64, wherein the edge pairs are found and an image size can be calculated).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to calculate the size of an image by the method of Son in the image size detecting step of Rourke. The motivations for doing so would have been to save memory space by providing proper clipping to only save what is needed in the memory (Son col. 2 lines 3-4), to provide a more robust edge detection algorithm (Son col. 6 line 48), and to perform size detection without the use of extra hardware because the edge detection is completed not by hardware units but by software steps in controller/processor 50 as shown in Fig. 3 of Son.

The combination of Rourke and Son does not specifically teach only performing one scan to complete the tasks of scanning in order to detect original size and only using the scan data of one scan for printing as well.

However, Takahagi et al. (US 6621994) teaches a prescanless mode where only one scan is performed, and that first scan data is used for size detection, printing and all other tasks (col. 7 line 7 – col. 9 line 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to not use a prescan and only have one full scan in scanning, image processing, and printing systems as taught by Takahagi. The motivation for doing so would have been to speed up the time per original (Takahagi col. 9 lines 11-15).

Regarding claim 20, which depends from claim 19, Rourke further teaches the steps of:

**(a) storing said scan data** (Fig. 2, wherein the scan data enters controller 7 and is manipulated for printing and stored in disk 56; col. 4 lines 53-56); **and**

**(b) printing said copy from said stored scan data** (printed from printer 8 as shown in the 9th step of Fig. 14).

Regarding claim 22, which depends from claim 19, Son further teaches that **the step calculating a size of said original image from said location of said boundary comprises the steps of:**

**(a) detecting a first pixel of said original in a line of scanned pixels** (col. 5 line 37 teaches working with a group of successive pixels, thus implying detecting pixels);

**(b) detecting another pixel of said original in a line of scanned pixels** (col. 5 line 37 teaches working with a group of successive pixels, thus implying detecting another pixel other than the first);

**(c) locating a first boundary of said original from said location of said first detected pixel** (Fig. 2 step 104, wherein an edge is located from the location of pixels in the scan line);

**(d) locating another boundary of said original from said location of said another detected pixel** (Fig. 2 step 112 wherein another edge is found from the location of pixels in the scan line); **and**

**(e) calculating a distance separating said first boundary and said another boundary** (Fig. 2 step 118 shows the left and right edge coordinates and col. 6 line 41 teaches summing the pixels in a line which is the distance between the edges).

6. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Son, Takahagi, and Rourke as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Furuoya (US 5805294).

Regarding claim 21, which depends from claim 19, while the combination of Rourke, Takahagi, and Son teach the scanning, size detection, and multiple printing of an original, the combination does not specifically teach calculating the number of scan lines.

Furuoya teaches a scanning system for document size detection including calculating the number of scan lines (Fig. 4 line counter $23_2$, col. 3 lines 60-61, wherein the lines are counted to determine document size) as including in **the steps of:**

**(a) identifying at least two scan lines including a detected pixel of said original** (counting of the lines implies identifying the lines to count);

**(b) locating a first boundary and a second boundary of said original according to a relationship of said detected pixels** (col. 3 line 62 teaches the reset of the counter at the final boundary of the page, which also implies that the counter starts counting when the first boundary – beginning of the page – is located); **and**

**(c) calculating a number of scan lines intervening between said first and said boundaries** (Fig. 4 line counter $23_2$, col. 3 lines 60-61, wherein the lines are counted to determine document size).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to detect document length, as in Son with the method of Furuoya, namely detecting the length of a document by counting the scan lines as well known to those of ordinary skill in the art. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide more correct document size calculations (col. 2 lines 4-5, wherein the method of Furuoya provides for correct detection of positions of edges).

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 2/23/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's arguments on page 10 that Gusmano does not teach the newly added limitation.

As discussed above, as currently examined, the new limitation is believed to be new matter, non-enabled, and indefinite. Thus, the claim cannot be properly examined. As close as possible an interpretation has been made for prior art purposes and Gusmano does teach these features as discussed in the rejection above.

With respect to applicant's arguments that the 103 rejection of Gusmano and Takahagi was improper.

In reply, there seems to be an agreement that the prior art does teach a motivation (Takahagi col. 9 lines 11-15, the time savings of the using the prescanless mode). Applicant's

arguments therefore are more directed towards the reasonable expectation of success. As a first note, both Gusmano and Takahagi are both scanning/copying systems developed by Xerox. Further, Takahagi teaches that it is well known in the art for one of ordinary skill in the art to be able to decide and implement either the pre-scan or prescanless modes (col. 9 lines 1 – 15). Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly have reasonable expectation of success in combining the two scanning/copying systems.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lucas Divine whose telephone number is 571-272-7432. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams can be reached on 571-272-7471. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Lucas Divine
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

ljd